

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final rejection dated March 24, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9-17, 19 and 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Cox, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,543) in view of Wayne, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,203,525). However, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that the generally straight distal end forms an angle with the axis of the catheter body ranging from about 75° to about 110°. Neither Cox nor Wayne teach or suggest such a feature. The Examiner states that Wayne discloses that the generally straight porous electrode forms the recited angle and points generally to Columns 5-23 and Figures 1-39 of Wayne as support for that contention. Applicant notes that Columns 5-23 represent nearly the entire Detailed Description of the Wayne patent, and Figures 1-39 represent nearly all of the drawings of the patent. The Examiner has not pointed to any specific passage in the Wayne reference that discloses the recited feature. Indeed, Wayne fails to disclose that the generally straight porous electrode forms the recited angle. In fact, Wayne fails to disclose heel shaped curve having a generally straight distal end or generally straight porous electrode. In particular, nowhere in Columns 5-23 does Wayne describe a generally straight distal end having any angle relative to an axis of the catheter body. As such, Wayne fails to teach or suggest a generally straight distal end or porous electrode having an angle within the recited range. Rather, Wayne discloses numerous looped structures, as shown in Figures 3A, 4A, 4B, 5-7, 9-11, 12A, 12B, 13, 19, 36 and 39, and described in numerous places throughout Columns 5-23, including for example, column 7, line 57 through column 8, line 44 and column 11, line 41 through column 12, line 53. These looped structures are neither depicted in the drawings or described in the disclosure as including a generally straight distal end or porous electrode forming an angle with an axis of the catheter body within the recited range. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 17, and all claims dependent therefrom, including claims 2, 4, 6, 9-16, 19 and 22-29, are allowable over Cox and Wayne.

The Examiner also rejected claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Cox and Wayne in view of one or more of Fung, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,129,476) and

Appln No. 10/622,221
Amdt date June 24, 2008
Reply to Office action of March 24, 2008

Swanson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,513). However, each of claims 30-32 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 17, both of which are allowable over Cox and Wayne, as discussed above. Neither Fung nor Swanson remedy the deficiencies of Cox and Wayne as neither reference teaches or suggests the catheters recited in independent claims 1 and 17. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 17, and all claims dependent therefrom, including claims 30-32, are allowable over Cox, Wayne, Fung and Swanson.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-17, 19 and 22-32 now remain pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 1 and canceled claim 6. The amendments find full support in the original specification, claims and drawings, and no new matter is presented. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all of pending claims 1, 2, 4, 9-17, 19 and 22-32 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests a timely indication of allowance. However, if there are any remaining issues that can be addressed by telephone, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's counsel at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Anne Wang
Reg. No. 36,045
626/795-9900

LES/les

LES PAS800674.1-*06/24/08 1:55 PM